Expected Outcome 1: Business Knowledge

Students will demonstrate an understanding of the professional practice of interior design including the testing, certification and licensure process.

Assessment Method 1: Assessment test results in CADS 3500 Professional Practices

Assessment Method Description

The following essay questions, number 11, 13, and 19 focused on professional practice, the testing, certification and licensure process. The specific answers were to be listed and discussed in an intelligent and cohesive manner.

Questions:

11. What is the history of Alabama’s licensure? Briefly hit the important points and timeline.

13. What are the steps necessary to sit for the NCIDQ exam if you graduate from Auburn?

19. What are the recent changes in the NCIDQ exam? Be specific.

Question 11 was worth 4 points

Question 13. was worth 3 points

Question 19. was worth 3 points

Findings

Question # 11.

Twelve students out of 21 scored 4 points. Fifty one percent made a perfect score. Two students scored 3.5 and another 4 scored 3 points. Two students scored 2 and only one student scored 1 point. Two thirds of the students who took the test scored above 88%. Three out of
twenty one students scored less than 50%.

**Question #13.**

Fifteen students scored 3 out of three possible on this question. Two students scored 2.5. Three scored two and one scored 1. More than 71% of the students scored a perfect score. Another 10% scored better than 83%. One student scored 33%.

**Question # 19.**

Thirteen students scored 3 out of three possible points. One student scored 2.75 and two more scored 2.5. Three students scored two points and two scored one. Sixty two percent of students scored a perfect score.

More students answered question # 13 correctly than answered either question 11. or 19. correctly. Question # 19 was second in the ranking of number of students who answered it totally correctly.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

Because this is fundamentally important information to understand and express, other components will be added to the learning opportunities next time plus they will also make presentations concerning this information. They will hear it in lectures and also do research about it. It may be that the higher scores on question number 13 could be attributed to the personal nature of the wording. If all questions could relate better to the student it might help them to remember the information better. The students may be broken into groups to discuss these topics and the goal would be to relate the information directly to the students themselves. What benefits will this have for me? It may be better learned if they know how each topic will benefit them.

**Additional Comments**

---

**Healthcare-Specific Programming**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the perspectives and requirements relevant to the healthcare environment, and the role of programming in the successful selection and specification of healthcare-specific products for the interior environment.
**Assessment Method 1:** Evaluation of Oral Presentation of Design Development

**Assessment Method Description**

Evaluation of scores earned by 20 senior-level interior design students in oral presentations of design development for two major components of Project 4 in CAHS 5400 Institutional Design (Spring 2013). Criteria evaluated include:

*Project 4 Healthcare Design Development – Nursing Station and Typical Patient Room, Objective 2 FF&E and Finish Materials*

Selection and application of furniture, fixtures, equipment, and finish materials for the nursing station and typical patient room are appropriate to healthcare environment.

*Project 4 Healthcare Design Development – Nursing Station and Typical Patient Room, Objective 5 Evidence-Based Design Decisions*

Design decisions for the nursing station and typical patient room are clearly supported by evidence from the literature review. Evidence is rigorous and relevant to the design context.

**Findings**

*Project 4, Objective 2: FF&E and Finish Materials*

This objective was worth up to 20 points for the Nursing Station and 20 points for the Typical Patient Room. Each space was scored separately on a 20 point scale, for a total of 40 points. Scores on the Nursing Station 20 point assignment ranged from 17-19 with a mean score of 17.6. Scores on the Typical Patient Room 20 point assignment ranged from 17-19 with a mean score of 17.95. Grading rubric comments indicate that high scoring students generally demonstrate excellent attention to selection and application, while low scoring students generally make appropriate decisions in selection and application, but may have missed one or two key items. Grading rubric comments indicate that all students met the minimum requirements for this objective, which is to be expected in a senior capstone course.

*Project 4, Objective 5: Evidence-Based Design Decisions*
This objective was worth up to 20 points. Scores ranged from 16.5-18.5 with a mean score of 17.36. Grading rubric comments indicate that high scoring students generally demonstrate specific and clear connections between the literature and design decisions, while low scoring students may reference the literature but fail to make clear and specific connections to design decisions. Grading rubric comments indicate that all students made some use of literature to support design decisions, but that improvements can still be made in the quantity and quality of literature reviewed.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

In the next offering of this course the same project and objectives will be used. However, more emphasis will be given to the documentation of evidence-based design decisions in the early stages of the project. Further, the assessment of evidence-based design decisions will be subdivided into two distinct sub-objectives: 1) use of appropriate literature to support design decisions and 2) clear articulation and documentation of how literature supports specific design decisions. This change is intended to enable the instructor to better assess different aspects of student work, and to aid in determining where the instructor should focus course-related improvements.

**Additional Comments**

---

**Process Knowledge**

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the theories and concepts of space planning and its role in the successful composition of the three dimensional space.

**Assessment Method 1:** Evaluation of Process Notebooks

**Assessment Method Description**

Evaluation of documentation provided in process notebooks by 27 junior-level interior design students for Projects 1 and 3 in CAHS 3200 Residential Interiors (Fall 2012)

Successful application of process knowledge requires that student work include documentation from three stages of the design process: programming, schematic design, and design development. In the
grading rubric, these items are described as:

- Programming section with fleshed out client program
- Schematic section with process work including bubble flow, adjacency matrix, furniture layouts, and space planning drafts
- Design development section with process work, including drafts of presentation drawings, notes, and other appropriate evidence of work

In response to assessment findings from last year, a greater emphasis was placed on the schematic phase. Schematic design process was worth 50 points for both Project 1 (Hilltop House) and Project 3 (Beach House) grading rubrics.

**Findings**
This objective was worth up to 50 points in both Project 1 (Hilltop House) and Project 3 (Beach House). Scores on Hilltop House ranged from 28 to 46 with a mean score of 39.9. Scores on the Beach House ranged from 41 to 46.5 with a mean score of 42.7. The data reveals that there is little change in scores at the high end of the bell curve between Projects 1 and 3. However, there is a significant difference in scores at the low end of the bell curve between the two projects – a thirteen point change. This improvement can be explained by two factors. First, students may have had time and opportunity to adjust to the expectations of the course between the first and third project. Second, lectures and instructor feedback between the two projects may have improved student understanding of – and ability to apply – appropriate schematic design process standards to their work.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**
Process knowledge is very important within the design professions, for day-to-day success on the job as well as meeting the required knowledge levels for professional certification in most states. Therefore, improving student learning outcomes in this area has been a vital part of the instructor’s goals in improving this course. Based on assessment for Fall 2011, grading of the schematic phase was more closely monitored to allow the instructor to analyze which portions of the schematic phase were most difficult for students to meet in Fall 2012. Grading rubric comments indicate that students are having the most difficulty with bubble flow and space planning drafts, which may be partly due to an increased reliance on computer-aided design technologies. Therefore, for the next offering of the course the instructor aims to try several different exploratory approaches.
throughout the semester to see what approach best motivates students to appropriately document the schematic design phase.

Additional Comments

Product Knowledge
Students will demonstrate knowledge of materials and finishes as they relate to interior products and spaces.

Assessment Method 1: Assessment Method Description
Evaluation of exam questions taken by sophomore level students in CAHS 2400, Materials and Components

Two exams, midterm and final, are given in CAHS 2400 that address aspects of product knowledge as applied to interior design. The exam questions test understanding of the properties and appropriate applications for residential and commercial materials. Three attributes were evaluated on a five point scale (1=benchmark to 5=capstone): understanding of standards, installation methods, and contributions to indoor air quality.

Findings
Scores on all attributes ranged from 1-5. The highest mean score, 4.53, was for understanding of standards demonstrating an advanced level of understanding in standards as they apply to selecting the appropriate material for a space. The lowest mean score was 3.12 for understanding contributions to indoor air quality suggesting a basic understanding of the potential negative impact that can occur to the occupants of a space through the specification of certain materials. The overall mean score for understanding installation methods was 3.71, indicating a proficient understanding of the various methods and corresponding complications that can occur when installing interior materials.

How did you use findings for improvement?
More attention will be given the next time the course is taught to issues of indoor air quality. A quiz focusing solely on the contributing factors to indoor air quality will be integrated into the course along with in-class discussion. Additional assessment of product knowledge should occur in studio courses at the junior and seniors levels to
determine if the transference of learning is occurring from course to course.

Additional Comments

**Professional Attitudes and Skills**
Students will demonstrate personal professional characteristics appropriate for the workplace.

**Assessment Method 1:** External evaluation of performance on CADS 4920 Internship

**Assessment Method Description**
INDS students are required to complete a 10 week, fulltime internship (40 hours/week, 8 credit hours) in a professional design setting anywhere in the U.S. under the supervision of a registered Interior Designer or a state licensed Architect. The evaluation form used by on-site internship supervisors has attributes characterized as Professionalism, Personal Attributes, and Academic Competence. All 19 of the INDS students who interned in Summer 2013 were included in this assessment report. Mean evaluation scores were calculated for each of the items included in each of these attribute categories.

**Findings**
On a 4.0 scale, the students averaged 3.86 for the overall attributes of Professionalism and for Personal Attitudes. The average for academic competence was 3.64. Within each of these attributes the individual items were explored as well.

For the Professionalism attribute, the lowest score was 3.62 for "Communication of Design Solution". The other scores ranged from 3.8 "Timeliness in Completing Work" to 3.96 for "Appropriate in Demeanor, Appropriate in Dress, and Timeliness in Completing Work."

For the Personal Attitudes attribute, the lowest score was 3.54 for "Leadership." The remaining scores ranged from 3.71-3.96, with "Reliable, Dependable, Cooperative, Work Ethic, and Availability" earning an average of 3.96.

For the Academic Competence attribute, the lowest score was 3.25 for
"Knowledge of Products/Source." The remaining scores ranged from 3.56-3.82. Oral Presentation and Written Analysis Skills averaged 3.58 and 3.56 respectively. Accuracy and Creative averaged 3.63 and 3.68 respectively. Attention to Detail, Resourcefulness, and Innovation in Problem Solving averaged 3.75, 3.74 and 3.71 respectively.

| Student | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | Average |
|---------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Professionalism | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.62 |
| Appropriate in Demeanor | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.06 |
| Appropriate in Dress | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.96 |
| Response to Supervision | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.92 |
| Response to Criticism | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.85 |
| Response to Stress | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.67 |
| Timeless in Work | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.06 |
| Timeless in the Work | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.00 |
| Communication of Design Solution | 3.5 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3.5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.67 |
| Student's average score for Professionalism | 3.89 | 3.78 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.78 | 3.89 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.22 | 3.83 | 3.89 | 4.00 | 3.78 | 3.89 | 3.93 | 3.86 |

How did you use findings for improvement?

Because internships are required of all majors in the department and because on-site supervisors are always asked to evaluate interns, we plan to continue assessing professional characteristics in the coming year to monitor continuity and watch for any shifts in scoring.

Overall, the scores for Personal Attitudes and for Professionalism were very high, averaging 3.86 out of 4.0 possible. While the scores for Academic Competence were a bit lower, they were still very good, averaging 3.64 out of 4.0. As in the past, the lowest student evaluation was for the "Knowledge of Products/Source". To help address this area of the students' preparation for a career in Interior Design, the program is launching a Product Fair to be held in conjunction with the mandatory Spring 2014 INDS student meeting. The Interior Design Advisory Board members and the firms that provided sponsorships for the INDS Football Program ad will supply product displays as part of the Product Fair. Additionally, a new digital resource room is being renovated to offer enhanced learning opportunities for the INDS students.

Additional Comments